



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,735	12/08/2003	Sohail Baig Mohammed	MS1-1724US	3970
22801	7590	06/25/2010		
LEE & HAYES, PLLC 601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 1400 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER QUELER, ADAM M	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/25/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/730,735

Applicant(s)

MOHAMMED ET AL.

Examiner

ADAM M. QUELER

Art Unit

2178

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-47, 49-71, 73-75, 77-89 and 91-107 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 91-107 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-47, 49-71, 73-75 and 77-89 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/10/10
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 04/30/2010, Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed 6/10/2010, and IDS filed 06/10/2010.
2. Claims 1-13, 15-47, 49-71, 73-75, 77-89 and 91-107 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 15, 49, 73, and 77 are elected independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/30/2010 has been entered.
4. The information disclosure statement filed 6/10/2010 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the references are already part of the record. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Election/Restrictions

5. Claims 91-107 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 8/17/2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1-9, 49-51, 53-64, 69-71 and 73-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taymans, Wim, et al, GStreamer Application Development Manual (4/5/2003) and further in view of Manrique, Daniel, "X Window System Architecture Overview HOWTO" (5/22/2001). GStreamer Core Reference Manual, GstEvent (4/29/2003) is cited as evidence regarding Taymans.

Regarding independent claim(s) 1, Taymans discloses an a media engine (GStreamer) embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation (p. 5, bullet 2); the media engine being configured to use: one or more media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of media content (source elements, p. 9); one or more transforms communicatively linked with the one or more media sources and configured to operate on data received from the one or more media sources (filters and codecs, p. 9); and one or more media sinks configured to sink a media stream (sink elements, p. 10).

Taymans does not disclose displaying a presentation on device remote from the media engine. Manrique disclose presenting a presentation (a graphical application analogous to the media engine of Taymans) on a first computer (the workstation) that is remote from a second computing device where the necessary processing takes place (in examples this is the Cray, Solaris server or BSD mail server, §3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the X model of Manrique to Taymans to enable the principles of multiuser, multitasking timesharing (§2).

Regarding independent claim(s) 49, Taymans teaches: a system comprising: one or more computer-readable media; a media engine (GStreamer) embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation; the media engine being configured to use a media session (bin, Chapter 9); the media session being configured to use: one or more media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of media content (source elements, p. 9); one or more transforms communicatively linked with the one or more media sources and configured to operate on data

received from the one or more media sources (filters and codecs, p. 9); and one or more media sinks configured to sink a media stream (sink elements, p. 10).

Taymans does not disclose displaying a presentation on device remote from the media engine. Manrique disclose presenting a presentation (a graphical application analogous to the media engine of Taymans) on a first computer (the workstation) that is remote from a second computing device where the necessary processing takes place (in examples this is the Cray, Solaris server or BSD mail server, §3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the X model of Manrique to Taymans to enable the principles of multiuser, multitasking timesharing (§2).

Regarding independent claim(s) 73, Taymans teaches: a media engine (GStreamer) embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation; the media engine being configured to use a media session(bin, Chapter 9); the media session being configured to use at least one media processor (another bin, p. 23, para. 1), one or more bit pumps communicatively linked with the media processor (pads, Chap. 7), a one or more media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of media content (source elements, p. 9); one or more transforms communicatively linked with the one or more media sources and configured to operate on data received from the one or more media sources (filters and codecs, p. 9); and one or more media sinks configured to sink a media stream (sink elements, p. 10).

Taymans does not disclose displaying a presentation on device remote from the media engine. Manrique disclose presenting a presentation (a graphical application analogous to the media engine of Taymans) on a first computer (the workstation) that is remote from a second

computing device where the necessary processing takes place (in examples this is the Cray, Solaris server or BSD mail server, §3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the X model of Manrique to Taymans to enable the principles of multiuser, multitasking timesharing (§2).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 2, 50, Taymans discloses media engine exposes an application program interface that is used by an application to interact directly with the media engine, and indirectly with components used by the media engine (this appears to be the entire point of the reference, see pp. 3-6).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 3, 51, Taymans teaches destination associated with the media engine and configured to provide one or more media sinks (sink elements, p. 10).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 4, Taymans teaches the media engine is configured to provide support for both linear (mp3, p.11) and non-linear (AVI, p. 10) media sources.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 5, Taymans teaches the media engine is configured to provide transport control for the media content (p. 34, the httpsrc element handles network streaming which includes transport).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 6, Taymans teaches the media engine is configured to provide for asynchronous building and management of a media pipeline given a source of media content (p. 65, para. 2 in "Creating...").

Regarding dependent claim(s) 7, Taymans teaches the media engine is configured to provide source resolution (p. 57).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 8, Taymans teaches the media engine is configured to provide access to at least some of its used components (p. 7, initializing provides the access).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 9, Taymans teaches the media engine the media engine is configured to enable adjustment of a media processing pipeline configuration (p. 51).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 53, Taymans teaches receive information from the media engine, said information being associated with (a) media content that is to be the subject of a presentation, and (b) a destination that is configured to provide one or more media sinks (capabilities, p. 17), and cause the media content to be presented (p. 23, para. 3)

Regarding dependent claim(s) 54, Taymans teaches the media session is configured to manage data flow from said one or more media sources to said one or more media sinks (p. 23, para. 3).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 55, Taymans teaches media session exposes one or more methods that enable the media engine to configure the media session for a presentation (p. 23, para. 3).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 56, Taymans teaches media session exposes one or more methods that enable the media engine to configure the media session for a presentation, wherein one method comprises a method through which a topology on the media session is initialized (p. 23, para. 3, p. 25).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 57, 71, Taymans teaches media session exposes one or more methods that enable the media engine to configure the media session for a presentation (p. 23, para. 3).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 58, Taymans is configured to provide methods to start, stop and pause a presentation (Chapter 11).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 59, Taymans teaches preroll method that is used by the media engine to notify the media session to prepare for the start of a presentation (ready state, p. 29).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 60, Taymans teaches a plurality of information methods that can be used by the application to obtain information that pertains to the session (p. 11, bottom section).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 61, Taymans comprises a plurality of information methods that can be used by the media engine to obtain information from the media session, wherein one information method enables the media engine to ascertain a globally unique identifier that is associated with a particular implementation of a media session (p. 11, an object can a unique name, and can be accessed as a property).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 62, Taymans teaches one of the information methods enables the application to ascertain multiple capabilities of the session (p. 17).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 63, 64, Taymans teaches to generate (set a state, Chap. 11) and send an event to an engine associated with each of said start, stop and pause methods (p. 47, schedulers monitor the state).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 69, 70, GCRM is cited as evidence that Taymans teaches an event is rate change (p. 5, GST_EVENT_RATE).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 74, Taymans teaches or more bit pumps are configured to pull data from the media processor (pad_pull (), p. 43).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 75, Taymans teaches one or more bit pumps are configured to pull data from the media processor and to push pulled data to one or more media sinks (p. 43).

9. Claims 77-82, 85-86 and 88-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thompson, Chris, "DirectShow For Media Playback In Windows" Parts 1-3, Last part dated 9/13/2000.

Regarding independent claim(s) 77, Thompson teaches a media engine embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation; the media engine being configured to use: one or more media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of media content (p.2, source filter; one or more transforms communicatively linked with one or more media sources and configured to operate on data received from the one or more media sources (transform filter, p.2); and one or more media sinks configured to sink a media stream (p. 2, render filter); the media engine further being configured to first partially resolve a topology that is to be utilized to present the presentation (p. 17, create first filters), and then cause a full topology to be resolved and activated (p. 17, render an output pin).

Thompson does not disclose displaying a presentation on device remote from the media engine. Manrique disclose presenting a presentation (a graphical application analogous to the media engine of Thompson) on a first computer (the workstation) that is remote from a second computing device where the necessary processing takes place (in examples this is the Cray, Solaris server or BSD mail server, §3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the X model of Manrique to Thompson to enable the principles of multiuser, multitasking timesharing (§2).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 78, Thompson discloses a session (graph builder, p. 11).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 79, Thompson discloses wherein the media session is configured to fully resolve said partial topology by at least ascertaining transforms that are to be placed between the media sources and the media sinks (p. 9-10).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 80, Thompson discloses wherein the media engine is configured to receive calls from the application and forward the calls to the media session, said calls comprising calls to start, stop and pause the presentation (graph states, pp. 8-9).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 81, Thompson discloses the media session is configured to create a media processor that uses one or more media sources and one or more transforms (the graph, p. 1).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 82, Thompson discloses the media session is configured to create a media processor that uses one or more media sources and one or more transforms, wherein the media session is configured to set a topology on the media processor (pp. 9-10).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 85, Thompson teaches wherein the media session is configured to receive calls from the media processor to at least start, stop and pause the presentation (graph states, pp. 8-9).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 86, Thompson teaches the media session is configured to receive calls from the media processor to at least start, stop and pause the presentation (graph states, pp. 8-9), wherein the media session is configured to send events to the media engine associated with calls that the media session receives from the media engine (p. 6).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 88, Thompson teaches the media session is configured to validate one or more component that handles data of the presentation (determining the filter can handle the data, pp. 9-10).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 89, Thompson teaches the media engine partially resolves said topology by at least determining one or more media sources and one or more media sinks for the presentation (pp. 9-10).

10. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taymans and Manrique.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 52, Taymans does not explicitly disclose components that are not visible to the application or media engine. Official Notice is taken that it was well-known for objects such as bins to have private members that are not visible to other objects for the purpose of encapsulation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have such components because it would have enabled good programming by encapsulation.

11. Claim 87 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson and Manrique.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 87, Thompson does not disclose prerolling. Official Notice is taken that it was well-known to reduce glitches associated with a presentation by prerolling media data samples. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to preroll as it would reduce glitches.

12. Claims 10-13, 15-22, 22-36, 41, 43 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taymans and Manrique, and further in view of Blome, Michael et al. "Core Media Technology in Windows XP Empowers You to Create Custom Audio/Video Processing Components" (7/2002). "IFileSourceFilter Interface", hereinafter MSDN, is cited as evidence regarding Blome.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 10-13, Taymans does not expressly disclose the stream selection modes. Blome discloses a media engine with two modes where either the application of the engine (application or FGM, p. 5, para. 5) selects which media streams (format of the data) are used (§ “The Connection Protocol”, p. 5, specifying which two pins should attempt to connect, they must agree on the media type which is a type of stream). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the stream selection of Blome in Taymans as it would provide flexibility of selection to a similar media engine in Taymans.

Regarding independent claim(s) 15, Taymans discloses a media engine embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation (p. 5, bullet 2); the media engine being configured to use: one or more media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of media content (source elements, p. 9); one or more transforms communicatively linked with the one or more media sources and configured to operate on data received from the one or more media sources (filters and codecs, p. 9); and one or more media sinks configured to sink a media stream (sink elements, p. 10).

Taymans discloses the media engine is configured to present a presentation on a first computing device (the device across the network where the file resides) that is remote from a second computing device (the device on which GStreamer resides) on which the media engine resides (httpsrc, p. 34, shows opening a remote presentation, i.e., the presentation is remote from the executing device).

Taymans does not explicitly disclose a plurality of open methods. Blome discloses a similar media engine that calls a RenderFile method (p. 3, paragraphs describing Figs. 1 and 2).

MSDN is cited as evidence that such a call calls one multiple open methods that are part of a media engine that can be called by an application to specify data sources in different manners (MSDN shows that RenderFile calls Load for a particular type of source filter). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the functionality of RenderFile in Taymans because it packs a lot of functionality into one call (p. 3, para. describing Fig. 2).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 16, 35, GCRM is cited as evidence that Taymans was configured to send events associated with a media presentation to an application (p. 4, description).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 17, 19, 20, 22, Taymans does not explicitly disclose a plurality of open methods. Blome discloses a similar media engine that calls a RenderFile method (p. 3, paragraphs describing Figs. 1 and 2). MSDN is cited as evidence that such a call calls one multiple open methods that are part of a media engine that can be called by an application to specify data sources in different manners (MSDN shows that RenderFile calls Load for a particular type of source filter, including a URL, which is an object that media, which is a bytestream can be obtained by). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the functionality of RenderFile in Taymans because it packs a lot of functionality into one call (p. 3, para. describing Fig. 2).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 18, Taymans does not explicitly disclose a plurality of open methods. Blome discloses a similar media engine that calls a RenderFile method (p. 3, paragraphs describing Figs. 1 and 2). Blome teaches the media source is created by the application (Fig. 4, "pGraph->AddFilter(pCapture, L"CaptureFilter");). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the functionality of RenderFile in Taymans because it packs a lot of functionality into one call (p. 3, para. describing Fig. 2).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 21, 22, Taymans discloses an open method that specifies a topology to be used (p. 33, "pipeline" is specified in the iterate method).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 23, Taymans is configured to provide methods to start, stop and pause a presentation (Chapter 11).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 24, Taymans teaches to generate (set a state, Chap. 11) and send an event to an application associated with each of said start, stop and pause methods (p. 47, schedulers monitor the state).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 25, Taymans teaches a plurality of information methods that can be used by the application to obtain information that pertains to the presentation (p. 11, bottom section).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 26, Taymans teaches one of the information methods enables the application to be exposed to multiple capabilities of the media engine (p. 17).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 27, Taymans teaches one of the information methods enables the application to ascertain when the system's capabilities change (Chapter 27).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 28, Taymans teaches an information method that enables the application to obtain metadata associated with the presentation (Chapter 11).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 29, Taymans does not teach a property store. Official Notice is taken that a property store was a well-known desired way to exchange metadata. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a property store for that reason.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 30, Taymans teaches one of the information methods enables the application to ascertain a current destination (p. 17, properties of a pad which is a destination).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 31, 32, Taymans teaches one of the information methods enables the application to ascertain statistics associated with the media engine (Chap. 11, states are statistics).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 33, 34, Taymans teaches retrieving a clock (p. 47, bullet 4).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 36, GCRM is cited as evidence that Taymans teaches an event associated with he new presentation (p. 5, GST_EVENT_NEW_MEDIA).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 41, GCRM is cited as evidence that Taymans teaches an event rendering of a last data sample from an active media source (p. 5, GST_EVENT_EOS).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 43, GCRM is cited as evidence that Taymans teaches an event is associated with a switch between presentations (p. 5, GST_EVENT_NEW_MEDIA).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 47, GCRM is cited as evidence that Taymans teaches an event is rate change (p. 5, GST_EVENT_RATE).

13. Claims 37-40, 42 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taymans, Manrique and Blome as applied to claim 35 above, and further in view of "EvCode.h", hereinafter Smith.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 37, the above combination does not teach an event associated with a completion of an open method. Smith discloses events for a media engine including an

event associated with a completion of an open method (pp. 2-3, EC_OPENING_FILE). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 38, the above combination does not teach an event is associated with completion of an operation begun by calling a start method on the media engine. Smith discloses events for a media engine including completion of an operation begun by calling a start method on the media engine (p. 3, EC_STREAM_CONTROL_STARTED). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 39, 42, the above combination does not teach an event is associated with completion of an operation begun by calling a stop method on the media engine. Smith discloses events for a media engine including an event associated with completion of an operation begun by calling a stop method on the media engine (p. 3, EC_STREAM_CONTROL_STOPPED). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 40, the above combination does not teach an event is associated with completion of an operation begun by calling a pause method on the media engine. Smith discloses events for a media engine including an event is associated with completion of an operation begun by calling a pause method on the media engine (p. 2, EC_PAUSED). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 44, the above combination does not teach an event is associated with a presentation destination change. Smith discloses events for a media engine including an event is associated with a presentation destination change (p. 3, EC_DISPLAY_CHANGED). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 45, the above combination does not teach an event is associated with a state change on the media engine. Smith discloses events for a media engine including an event is associated with a state change on the media engine (p. 4, EC_STATE_CHANGE). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 46, the above combination does not teach an event is associated with a change in a set of allowed operations on the media engine. Smith discloses events for a media engine including an event is associated with a change in a set of allowed operations on the media engine (p. 4, EC_EXTDEVICE_MODE_CHANGE). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

14. Claims 65-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taymans and Manrique as applied to claim 49 above, and further in view of "EvCode.h", hereinafter Smith.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 65, the above combination does not teach an event is associated with session start. Smith discloses events for a media engine including completion of a session start (p. 3, EC_STREAM_CONTROL_STARTED). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 66, 67, the above combination does not teach an event is associated with a session stop. Smith discloses events for a media engine including an event associated with a session stop (p. 3, EC_STREAM_CONTROL_STOPPED). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 68, the above combination does not teach an event is associated with a session pause. Smith discloses events for a media engine including an event is associated with a session pause (p. 2, EC_PAUSED). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

15. Claims 83 and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson and Manrique as applied to claim 78 above, and further in view of Blome.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 83, Thompson does not disclose time sources. Blome discloses wherein the media session is configured to make determinations as to which time sources are to be used to drive the presentation (p. 6, para, below Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Thompson and Blome because they dealt with the same engine.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 84, Thompson does not disclose preventing drift. Blome teaches the media session is configured to prevent drift between a rate of media sources and a rate of a time source being used in live scenarios (p. 6, para, below Fig. 7). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Thompson and Blome because they dealt with the same engine.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13,15-47,49-71,73-75 and 77-89 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

17. Applicant has also objected facts officially Noticed by the Office. Applicant has not specifically traversed these Notices. However, two references were included in the Advisory Action of 05/18/2010 to bolster the evidentiary record and further prove that such facts are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ADAM M. QUELER whose telephone number is (571)272-4140. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Adam M Queler/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178